

PROCEEDINGS
of
THE FIRST CALVINISTIC CONFERENCE
on
PSYCHOLOGY and PSYCHIATRY

held April 7 and 8, 1954
on the Calvin College Campus

NOTE:

The contents of this report are not necessarily verbatim quotations of the speakers. In most cases the speakers who introduced their subjects submitted their own digests or outlines. But the notations to their speeches as well as the contents of the subsequent discussions are a composite based on notes made by the Conference reporter and the newly appointed Conference secretary. Neither of these feels that he wants to accept responsibility for claiming that the comments herein presented were exactly in the form in which they were stated at the Conference. Rather, an attempt has been made to weave together a report which in a somewhat coherent continuity gives the thrust of what transpired. It is hoped that in the future it may be possible to reproduce papers exactly as they were given.

Jim Split - Conference Reporter
John T. Daling - Conference Sec'y,

Wednesday, April 7, 1954

- Morning Session -

Temporary chairman Rev. E. Heerema read Matthew 6:24-34, offered prayer, and made a few appropriate remarks concerning our mutual conviction that human experience by itself cannot stand alone.

Pres. Wm. Spoelhof, of Calvin College, gave a short welcoming speech in which he stressed the need of integration among educators, ministers, physicians, psychiatrists, etc. for the proper understanding and treatment of man's ills.

Dr. K. Kuiper, M. D. - PSYCHIATRY IN OUR CHRISTIAN MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Speaker's digest of his talk: In common with all mental hospitals we recognize two broad functions; long-term custodial care and active treatment. Wherein then does our distinctiveness lie? Not to minimize in any way the importance of the motivation of Christian love in the area of continued care of the chronically ill patients, I submit that our greatest potential for service lies in active treatment of the various physical modalities, e.g., insulin and electro-shock therapy, but most particularly it means, I believe, helping these people attain the highest possible level of personality integration thru psychological means, in short, application of Christian psychotherapy. But such psychotherapy to be truly effective must be founded on a basic Christian psychology. It is to lay the groundwork for the development of such a thoro-going Christian psychology that this conference has been called.

Reporter-notations of this talk: The main area of the topic under discussion should be that of active treatment. It may well be that treatment of patients in terms of physical modalities may be only ancillary; that the core of the matter is to treat the person psychologically. It may take some time before we arrive at the basic Christian principles involved in Christian psychotherapy, but there actually is plenty of clinical material in our Mental Hospitals for our own study of psychopathology in the light of Scriptural data; viz., Matt. 6:24-34 about being not anxious for the morrow, and Luke 12:4 about fearing the Devil; these passages and their contexts would seem to indicate the Scriptural recognition of nameless dreads and anxieties on the one hand and on the other hand the necessity of having one kind of fear (the fear of the Lord) to overcome other sorts of fears. And if one then also takes into consideration David's plea that the Lord would search his heart and try his inmost thought, then it would seem necessary to explore the unconscious to find out the core of the person's unnamed fear(s). But this requires the use of techniques for such exploration, and perhaps this does not exclude psycho-analysis as a technique to be used by Christians too even tho it is considered to have a "smear" connected with it because of its associations with certain theories. Such examination of inner self seems also indicated in the liturgical form for the Lord's Supper with its exhortation to "self-examination"; granted that such "self-examination" is often superficial in that it is usually concerned

only with the external and the gross sins,,yet this also ties in with the notion of Jesus that evil proceeds from the heart of man. From these and other lines of evidence it would seem then quite clear that we should be using psycho-therapeutic measures in the treatment of the mentally ill, and that constructive research along these lines in our own institutions too might well lead not only to measures or techniques that are curative but also preventative. In these matters too we ought to be a salting salt in the community at large.

Discussion of Dr. Kuiper's talk:

What is your conception of the unconscious?

I am not prepared to give a complete statement of this, and no doubt our present knowledge or understanding of this aspect of the person's being is inadequate. Of course, the term almost immediately draws the attention to Freud, but even tho there is much that is controversial in his theory, one seemingly can accept the basic notion that there are areas in a person's psychical life which are not accessible to his conscious mind. And that there are areas like that would seem to be indicated, among other things, by the fact that we acknowledge that God's Spirit works in our "soul" without our always being aware of it; also we Christians believe we are re-born but many, if not most of us, were not aware of the moment that it took place.

What kinds of psychotherapy are being used in our hospitals?
Is use made of such things as dream analysis, projective techniques, interviews, etc.?

And what must be done to set up an ideal program along these lines?

Our present form of hospital system is in just the beginning stage. Our first concern is the care of the patients entrusted to us. To do our work properly requires a much greater staff with specialization not only for proper treatment but also for research. This, of course, requires funds as well as competently trained personnel. At present we are doing the best we can, but we are not doing what we ought for lack of time, staff, funds. We do make use of interviews, but some patients seem more interested in covering up than in giving information, and sometimes close questioning against the patient's will results in a more disturbed patient; on the other hand, some seem very eager to respond and with such we go as far as we can with the result that the patient himself often feels that he is being helped. And I believe too that there is room for projective techniques especially to highlight areas. Perhaps I ought to add, too, that as a physician working largely with Reformed patients I am faced with a problem: most of the patients think that their problems are spiritual, and we have our hospital chaplains to conduct the work of spiritual ministry among the patients; but I am convinced that even tho our people on the whole think of our mental hospitals as establishments of mercy, our patients actually need more than Christian care and kindness, there should be more concern with cure. But, as said before, this requires a greater staff, our own techniques, etc.; I make use of shock therapy and then follow this up with psychotherapy, but one or two of such sessions are hardly adequate.

Furthermore, adequate follow-up work is also important; there ought to be out-patient facilities for discharged patients or competent personnel such as psychiatric-social workers to visit the discharged patients, but in some of our hospital areas the practical considerations of funds and distances make such follow-up work almost unattainable. A really satisfactory psychotherapeutic procedure should, therefore, also involve the services of clinical psychologists, psychiatric nurses, properly trained social workers, and congenially disposed ministers in various localities also for effective follow-up work for discharged patients.

Comment by a member in the audience:

We have been followers long enough, we ought to become more positive ourselves. As a beginning we ought to help educate the Christian public to the matter of mental illness by the use of films e.g. the film "Man to Man." But with respect to our patients our biggest job is to get the patient to see that he is wrong. And we should be using the various available techniques to help the patient to come to this point. But together with the thrust of the second question of the Heidelberg Catechism we ought also to impress on them the thrust of the first question; that is to say, we must get the patient to see that he is wrong but also that he must seek for facilities and strength outside of himself to effectuate the reconciliation for or of his basic problem. The "wrongness" of the mentally ill person is sin; the "wrongness" goes back to such things as grudges, self-reference, projections, feelings of being hurt by some one, etc. Thus when it is considered that the cause of the mental illness is sin, the method of dealing with the patient is changed from that practiced by the non-believer. For unwillingness to forgive or unwillingness to accept someone else's faults is sin, thus there is need of the Christian concept of love and forgiveness.

This above comment evoked several counter-comments from various members, including such as the following:

Is mental illness always necessarily the result of the person's own sin? Isn't it possible that at least in some instances the mental illness is brought about by factors of which the person himself is not conscious, or factors that occurred unawaredly in the person's childhood experiences, or more directly the result of the person's earlier training formally or informally in the home itself or in the school? Another stated that tremendous difficulties are raised by the claim that sin is the cause of mental illness, for it may be seriously questioned whether sickness, at least some kinds, is a moral matter; Jesus himself indicated this when He was asked to judge whether the man's infirmity had been caused by that man's sin or the sin of his parents. Still another said that the distinction between normal and abnormal is a matter of degree, that many people have a sense of guilt but that in the mentally ill person the sense of guilt is disproportionate, also that the sense of guilt is not always directly related to the concept of sin but rather in relationship to what might happen if I did sin (e.g. what will happen if I get so angry that I try to knock off my dad's block!). Hence, to equate "guilt complex" with sin

is to introduce an artifact, it is granted that sin is generally present in human life; some sinful people become mentally ill, and some sinful people don't. The "normal" Christian sinful person confesses his sin and thus relieves his sense of guilt, the "abnormal" likewise may also confess but does not feel relieved of his sense of guilt. Why? Such is one of the problems for psychotherapy.

The rebuttal to these counter-comments was somewhat as follows:

What is the aim of our psychiatric work? We must go back to the question of sin. It is granted that at first patients can't stand this, and that it may throw them into a panic; but psycho-therapeutic work is not something ancillary but rather a full function of the total program to rehabilitate the patient. Are we to excuse a person from the sin of adultery or of thinking of adultery on the grounds that he is mentally sick? There is a great difference on this point between English and American courts: the former says "guilty and insane"; the latter says "guilty but insane." We must see what the sin is and then try to get the patient to see the sin and that he keeps from doing it again. Furthermore, this matter of sin also enters into the acceptance or rejection of theories, techniques, etc. and on this score there should be great reluctance in accepting the practice of lobotomies because the results are often disastrous to the characters of the patients; hence extreme caution ought to be exercised in this matter.

Another member made the following sort of comment:

There is need to emphasize the organic aspect of illness. The physical and the mental, or the somatic and the psychical may be so intertwined that illnesses of the one kind may have their roots in troubles of the other kind, and thus it may be not wise to make all-embracing statements one way or the other about the moral cause of illness whether mental or physical.

To this still another member commented to the effect:

I am thankful that in our circles the strict dichotomy of body and mind is at least gradually being scotched. There are multiple causations for human ailments, and we need many disciplines for their treatment. Furthermore, our kind of people often seem rather hasty in unnecessarily or perhaps even irrelevantly making moral pronouncements; e.g. when a mental patient says, "I feel so happy this morning I could dance." It would be therapeutically bad, to say the least, if some one would then say, "Don't let me ever hear you say that again because that is sin."

At about this point the question was asked, "The current view seems to be that there is a different brand of psychiatry in each of our own mental hospitals. Is this right Dr. Kuiper? That does seem to be the layman's point of view. Mechanics and facilities are often confused. However, there is no basic incompatibility in our

thinking on methods. Another added the comment that in one of our mental hospitals there are five physicians and each has a different approach but they all have one basic point of view.

There were also some comments made about Freud, some of these:

There seems to be some hesitancy about Freudianism. We ought to make use of the contributions that anyone advances, provided, of course, that they do not explicitly contradict Christian principles. It ought to be added that when Freud uses the concept of sex, he does not refer to sex as copulation but as a constellation of relationships between members of a family such as Oedipus, etc. Still another stated: We do not think of the sex act when Freud talks about sex. He has unquestionably made tremendous contributions to the understanding of the human being; not everything he said however was strictly original with him, rather, he presented more emphatically some of the concepts which were already in vogue in his day; and tho everything he said may not be able to stand the test from the Christian point of view, we can hardly escape using his type of thinking to a certain extent.

There were still other comments and suggestions like the following:

Shouldn't our Christian colleges make appeals to students who have the aptitudes and abilities to encourage them to go into various aspects of psycho-therapeutic work?

Are our mental institutions in a position to employ the students who as a matter of fact are equipping themselves for psycho-therapeutic work? There ought to be papers at future conferences on various aspects of the many problems that have come under consideration at this session.

There ought to be papers at future conferences on the various "depth" or "analytic" psychologists so that there is a better understanding of what they themselves meant and also on the extent that their contributions can be used by those committed to the Christian view.

Perhaps it would be well to have a paper too on the topic of "Sin and Mental Health."

Wednesday April 7, 1954

- Afternoon Session -

Prof. Jan Waterink, Th.D. - SOME REMARKS ON "THE ORGANIZATION OF THE HUMAN PERSONALITY"

1. "Man is a unity and has to be seen as a totality."⁽¹⁾ The human being is an organized unity because he is created in the image of God, therein lies his distinctiveness from the animals. The human being is more than the sum total of his experiences for there is also something about him which determines what these experiences will be. Nor is the human being some sort of mechanical composition of two discretely different things: his body and his "soul." To consider the distinguishable aspects or features of the human being as also being distinct, or separate, is erroneous procedure. By analogy, the typical American "scientific" procedure is to take a flower and dissect it into its various components such as petals, sepals, stamens, etc.; but in the process the flower as a flower, as a unity created by God, is lost or has disappeared; to really understand or appreciate the flower, it must be seen again as a totality. So too in regard to the human being.
2. "We can distinguish between the ego and the psycho-somatic totality." The psycho-somatic is hereditary in its origin, but the ego is a direct creation of God. Yet, the ego cannot function vacuously, it functions in and is influenced by its psycho-somatic context. "Ego" is the conscious subject of all of a person's doing; it is that which can be self-conscious, which has a religious nature, which knows, directs, has a sense of responsibility, etc.
3. "In the personality we know there are different levels." The distinguishable levels here are those of the chemico-physical, the vegetative, the "psychical ground" or unconscious aspect of psychical life such as past experiences or deep seated wishes etc., the conscious, and the spiritual that is the self-conscious or reflective level.
4. "The 'ego' is the created 'kernel' of the human individual." For each individual this is a direct creation. Thus Christ was man, not a man; He had a human psyche and a human body, but Divine Ego.
5. "The psycho-somatic 'totality' has 'inherited' qualities." It should be borne in mind that at conception there is not simply a mechanical meeting of chemico-physical entities, but in conception there is a meeting of two living cells. There is, therefore, the possibility not only of transmission of both general "psychical" characteristics and perhaps even of specific ones.

(1) The statements in quotation marks are the actual words of the speaker's outline, the others are annotations.

6. "Man cannot be a real 'personality' without 'integration' and 'regulation'." To be considered a "personality" the person must be a "ripe", a full-grown, a fully matured, and independent being. This on the one hand, therefore, involves "integration", i.e. all of the person's different fields of psychical being must be harmoniously developed and interrelated not only within the person himself but also with respect to his adaptation to the outer world. But on the other hand, this also involves "regulation" i.e. the person must control both his inner and his outer life in accordance with rules which are determined by norms; and for the Christian such norms are objective (not subjective or conventional based on or derived from Divine revelation).
7. "We have to distinguish between personality and character." The former refers to what the person is; the latter refers to how he does.
8. "The character may be seen as the color of the personality." Character refers to how the person uses his qualities. And how the person's character is formed and exercised is a matter of polarity, of operating somewhere between the extremes of various psychical traits e.g. between being pretentious and being unpretentious. Whenever a person tends to go to the extreme with respect to the one or the other of paired-poles of traits, the person is mentally ill.
9. "Conscience has a 'formal' and a 'material' side, and belongs to personality." Conscience is involved in the "regulation" of character. From its formal side, conscience is something innate; i. e. each person has within him a self-consciousness of an ethical conviction that there is a rightness and a wrongness about his action. From the standpoint of its material content, conscience is the product of the human being's experiences including such factors as education both formal and informal in both the home and the school, general revelation, contacts in the social environment, etc. Each person, therefore, innately knows that there is good and evil, but it learns what is considered to be good and what evil.
10. "It is a question of the 'moral character' whether or not man is obedient to the voice of his conscience." It is one thing to know what is considered to be good and what bad, but it is another thing to act in accordance with such knowledge. Thus whether a person does do what his conscience dictates and the extent to which he does so, is again a matter of the person's character; e.g. like some husbands who let their wives "prattle" without paying attention to it, so some may also let their conscience "talk" without regarding it.

Discussion of Prof. Waterink's talk:

It was stated that the "ego" directs the activities of the psyche and the soma, how soon does this begin in human life?

Just when the "ego" is created by God in the pre-natal stage is an open question. But at birth it is already present, not as a strange extraneously interjected element, but so to speak fused with and functioning within the context of the psychical and the somatic of that individual; the human being is functionally a unit, an inter-related totality, not a compartmentalized aggregation.

What do you think of the theory that a child's life is determined during the first five years of its life?

This is a very important period of the human being's life history. As a matter of clinically verified fact, most neuroses have their bases in or during the first six years of life. In most cases such neuroses are the result of the fact that either the mother had too strong a grip on the child and thus did not allow the child's own individuality to develop properly during this period, or the opposite extreme of having little or no grip at all on the child so that the social aspect of the child's being did not develop properly.

Where in your system does fear, guilt, anxiety fit in, and where or how does "Christmindedness" enter in?

Fear, guilt, anxiety, etc. are the result of sin. But sin itself is not a thing, an entity; it is not something positive but something negative (tho active); that is to say, sin is "not to have the righteousness of God." The "ego" is created as a religious being, i.e. to serve, to serve God; after the Fall, this religious aspect of "serving" still continues but the "ego" now directs this to serving self or serving nature. The unbeliever thus lives under the power or domination of his own psyche, or as Paul states it, the natural man is under bondage to serve the law of the flesh. In the case of "re-birth", the "ego" is re-directed to the Spirit of God, and thus the re-born person finds a new rule in life; the law of the Spirit, for the spirit (or ego) of the person now has contact with the Spirit of God. However, the re-born person still has his psychical-somatal being and thus he experiences conflict with two opposing tendencies in himself; as Paul states it too that in his inmost being he desires to serve the law of the spirit but his psychical-somatal being still wants to serve the law of the flesh. It is this struggle between these opposing directions in the lives of Christians which provides the "kernel" for some of the problems which Christian psychologists and psychiatrists have to face or deal with.

When you reserve the term "personality" for a mature, independent being, what would you call the human being before he is "ripe"?

In our ordinary language we call a small, green, fruit of a certain kind an apple, but it actually isn't really an apple until it is full-grown and ripe. Philological history shows that repeatedly there have been attempts to form a word which would designate the mature, independent human being; the being that is capable of carrying out its own role in life, make its own decisions, etc. Thus

the term "person" was first used in Greek plays to indicate the one who was acting out a role in the play, but gradually the term became "corrupted" in the sense of referring to anyone in the play and later to any one in life; latter the term "personal" was formed to indicate that which belongs to the person that plays a role, but it too came to have a more generalized meaning; then the adjectival form was in turn made substantival in the form of personality to indicate the kind of human being who had developed sufficiently to carry out his own role in life. And it is in this sense that it was used in the talk; i.e. a term used to designate the human being whose whole realm of spiritual, psychical, and somatic powers have by him become organized into an integrated and regulated unity. Thus before the human being achieves this stage he is a person but not a personality.

There have been American psychologists who have said that "a child is not a person."
Do you subscribe to this?

This may, of course, mean that the child at birth is not a human being but only an animal, and that it becomes "humanized" later. But in any case, the baby as a baby is already a person, a human being, and not an ape. It can be shown by fairly simple tests that even before a baby is one year old it can manifest behavior which shows the operation of intelligence, whereas the ape's behavior is only a matter of association. e.g. if a certain association has been established in both the ape and the baby, and if a new factor is then introduced into the situation the ape will continue to behave in terms of its previous association whereas the baby's behavior is changed in terms of or by virtue of that new factor.

Is one to think of the "ego" in terms solely intellectual, or emotional, or volitional? And what about the Biblical notion that the "heart" is the most powerful aspect of human experience?

The Christian psychologist must use concepts that are consonant with the meaning of Scripture e.g. the image of God, immortality, etc. However, he must also be cognizant of the fact that the Bible was not intended to be a handbook for science, tho it does provide the basis for it, and thus one should not expect to find scientific definitions in Scripture. Scientific definitions are the fruit of Western thought. The Bible was written in the language of the Semitic people and that means too that it was written in terms of the everyday thinking of those people (altho it was not, of course, limited to the content of such thinking). Thus it was characteristic of the people in those days (as it is today too) to speak of the sun rising and the sun setting altho actually such is not "scientific"; and so too it was the practice in those days to consider three zones in human life: the head had to do with intelligence, the chest with spirit, and the abdomen with the emotions. Thus when the Bible states that "out of the heart are the issues of life", the context usually shows that there is a warning expressed in this connection to the effect that one should take care, be cautious, for when feelings or emotions get started controls have

to be exercised or else one is likely to fall into sin (e.g. if a man looks at an attractive girl, then if he is "moved", adulterous thoughts can easily arise). The Bible always warns against one-sidedness, thus it e.g. speaks of "loving with our mind" and "knowing with our heart." The "ego" is in its root the center of responsibility. There is, of course, no principial objection to calling this core of man's being the "heart" or "X" or anything else instead of the term "ego." But then it must not be claimed that such is the Scriptural definition of this "core." Care should be exercised that we do not read 20th century content into Biblical terms. Once more, definitions are man-made products of use in man's scientific (in the sense of wissenschaft) pursuits. The Bible is God's special revelation to tell us the way of redemption.

Is the "ego" the created kernel or core of man's being?

Yes, my view is that the "ego", the individuality, the essential "personness" of the human being is not hereditary but directly created by God. But it is unified into a totality with the hereditary psychical and somatic as the instrument for the expression of the "ego." But this created "ego" must not be considered as something static, it too develops; this is clear also in the case of Jesus Christ who at birth had the "I" of God, yet as a child he played as a child, and learned as a child so that at the age of twelve He already showed much wisdom. If this is so with Christ, then it is possible, to conjecture that a child may know more than is normally evident or than it is normally capable of expressing e.g. a four year old child was dying of tuberculosis and in its last twenty-four hours it seemed to be freed from its bodily or human development impediment for it talked about things characteristic of an adult believing person even tho it was a child that was speaking.

Is it possible that at death the psyche is free from hindrance?

When the believer dies he goes to heaven. At death there is a corpse not a person. The unity of the ego-psychical-somatic which was that person no longer exists. At death the "ego" is, so to speak, torn out of the unity; the psychical and the somatic characteristic of that person die, they are no more (like that of the animal), but the "ego" lives on.

Can you point out any relationship between Freud's Ego and Id and your concepts of "Ego" and Psyche?

Freud's definitions of these concepts are not real, there is no place for Creation in his system. His "id" gives no satisfactory account for the human being's sense of personal responsibility, from the Christian point of view. He in effect denies that the human being at the outset is a human being and has a social nature.

Thursday, April 8, 1954

- Morning Session -

Rev. Wm. Hiemstra - PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY,
BASIC CONSIDERATIONS (1)

I. Introduction

- A. Material to be excluded from the discussion (now the pastor should make his visits, and other strictly practical considerations)
- B. Terminology

II. Definition

Pastoral psychology is that form of Christian care of the individual soul which utilizes a knowledge of psychology in conjunction with the use of the Word of God and prayer in order to promote spiritual health; (i.e.) a life lived in relationship to God through faith in Jesus Christ, guided by the revealed will of God, and directed into paths of Christian service.

III. The Legitimate Character of Pastoral Psychology

A. Biblical basis

- 1. Specific Scripture: the mandate of the Great Shepherd (Hebr. 13:20); also John 21:15-17; Acts 20:28-31; Eph. 4:11-13, and I Peter 5:1-4
- 2. General teaching: the image of God in man - Gen. 1:26-27 - teaches the unity of human personality; and the greatest traumaⁱⁿ human personality is estrangement from God.

B. Natural revelation: the right to appropriate the facts of psychology for a more effective pastoral ministry. (Cf. Psalm 19 as legitimate basis for astronomy, and I. Thess. 5:14 speaks of comforting the fainthearted which indicates that the spiritual cannot be divorced from the psychical and thus legitimates the use of psychological facts.)

C. The Challenge of Critics

- 1. Medical-unfavorable: the strict Freudians (e.g. like Millany Klein but not necessarily Karen Horney, who are not sympathetic because they consider religion as an infantile trend; and professional psychiatrists (who fear that the minister wants to be a sort of substitute psychiatrist).
- 2. Medical - favorable: those sympathetic to lay analysts and to religion as A. Adler and C. Jung (their attitude toward religion differs from that of Freud, because they want to cure with religion whereas Freud wanted to cure from religion); and those who practice a form of spiritual cure of souls, such as M. Gregory, F. Kunkel (In Search for Maturity), S. Blanton (Faith is the Answer), A. Maeder (Ways to Psychic Health), P. Tournier (these are all willing to have ministers cooperate).
- 3. Theological - unfavorable: the "traditionalists" (those who hold that the pastor must restrict himself to the spiritual ministry of the Word and prayer; perhaps

perhaps motivated by the fear of secularism, i.e. that the ministry will become psychological instead of Scriptural; and the Barthians (with their emphasis on ignoring the temporal and just preach salvation).

4. Theological - favorable: those who combine psychotherapy with pastoral care; J. S. Bonnell, L.D. Weatherhead, E. S. Waterhouse.

IV. The Specific Purpose of Pastoral Psychology.

- A. Primary - spiritual health (i.e. the right relationship with God and with one's fellowman; hence not merely anthropocentric).
- B. Secondary - mental and physical health (these are concomitants and sometimes even consequences of spiritual health).

V. The Restricted Sphere of Pastoral Psychology.

A. Qualifying Determinants of the Pastor

1. The pastor's personality: a) native temperament (he must be interested in people; hence not everyone's task because some do not like to talk to people or do not like to discuss their problems); and b) the presence of personal problems (if the pastor in his own experience has seen lots of miseries resulting viz. from alcoholism, he may have an unwholesome emotional prejudice which may interfere with effective help in this area; similarly if he himself is emotionally involved in other areas).
2. The pastor's training: theoretical and clinical.

B. Qualifying Determinants of the Problem or Illness

1. Healthy people with conflicts that are not neurotic (e.g. he can help in cases of marital conflicts, or sex phobias in adolescents)
2. Normal people with neurotic tendencies (he can try to be of general assistance).
3. Sick people with neurotic and psychotic symptoms (he can help in some cases, but in most cases he should refer these to a psychiatrist and perhaps carry out a supportive role).

VI. The Proper Means of Pastoral Psychology

- A. The Word of God and Prayer - Acts 6:4 - (These means should be) used with psychological understanding (as illustrated in the case of doubt (which need not necessarily have a religious root but which may result from a variety of causes such as secular education, psychological involution, inferiority feelings, or the kind of early training which assumed "faith is a gift of God and I'm waiting for it").

- B. Psychological techniques (involving) related aspects of counseling (such as client-centered, or non-directive or responsive).

VII. Evaluation of Recent Trends in Pastoral Psychology

- A. European (in some places there is wholesome cooperation between the pastor and the psychologist or psychiatrist and vice versa)
- B. American (the pastor should have a knowledge of psychology and of psychotherapy but he should not practice it)

- - - - -

DISCUSSION of Rev. Hiemstra's talk:

Is there some way to determine borderline cases?
What are the indications that would be helpful in spotting a person needing help?

For those who can read the Dutch, a good book on this subject is: Dr. Fernhout: Predikant en Dokter. For present purposes, psychological troubles can be divided into: character neuroses and acute neuroses or psychoses. The borderline cases of the former type are indicated when the person himself can no longer solve his problems of daily life, such is often indicated by a loss of interest in the ordinary things of life or feelings of sinfulness, even though he can and does still adjust himself to social and economic life in general. Acute neuroses or psychoses are often indicated by the presence of delusions or hallucinations. In the case of character neuroses, like inferiority complexes and problems arising out of family situations, the minister can be of help initially but even here he may come to a point where he feels that he can no longer be of effective assistance and thus finds it necessary to refer the case to the psychiatrist. In cases of acute neuroses or psychoses, however, the psychiatrist is the principal person to give assistance altho this does not mean that the minister is completely out of the picture. There can be a time in the progress of the illness that both can cooperate but the situation may also become so bad that the psychiatrist is the only person that can help -viz. those in very distressed states - but as recovery comes the minister cooperating with the psychiatrist can again be of some assistance in counselling in those areas outside of the strictly psychiatric.

It should be added, however, that few ministers are capable of doing creditable pastoral psychology. Too many ministers are all too formal; they do not address themselves to the particular situations; they are too apt to dispense their own ready-made answers to life's problems; many of them themselves have neurotic tendencies and they are well versed in the Catechism, etc., they have the wrong psychological approach when they have the attitude of "Confess what you did and you will be sound again in one hour." Perhaps only about one out of ten ministers have the personality qualifications for suitable work in pastoral psychology.

On the other hand, it must be added too that in the Netherlands only about fifty percent of the psychiatrists are capable of understanding really religious problems (according to Prof. Jan Waterink, who had been asked by Rev. Hiemstra to comment on the above question) And as an added note it was stated that in the Netherlands too there is somewhat of a division between physiological psychiatrist and psychological psychiatrists.

What do you think, Prof. Waterink, of non-directive interviewing techniques?

That depends on the individual case. In some instances it is workable, i. e. for those who are willing to cooperate in such a method. But in other instances the non-directive method is definitely not a good one; e.g. a spoiled boy who by the time he is twenty-five is so neurotic that he has to be institutionalized, such a person may really be hungry for some one who will be a director for him, in other words he wants to be told what he should do - and there is much such "spoiling" of children in the Netherlands, Belgium and France in average and above average homes. On the other hand, psychoasthenic people (those who are super-sensitive to their own feelings and thoughts) should not be told outright "you must" do this or that, and yet such people do require directives which aim at a more rigid scheduling or routinizing of their daily activities, these then need directives but by indirect means. Persons who have too many fears to depart from their own thinking are not likely to profit much from non-directive therapy.

What do you think, Prof. Waterink, of the analytic methods of Freud and Jung?

These two are quite different. E.g. in dream analyses, Freud claims that the person must arrive at his own answer but Jung holds that the person must be helped to come to his answer. Neither of these two methods is universal. There is no one method that can be used indiscriminately for all cases. The method of treatment to be used must be of a kind that is suitable to each patient's particular needs. Perhaps once a year I use the strict old-fashioned Freudian method because that is just the one applicable to that particular case.

The comment was also made that Dr. Wm. Goulouze, of Western Seminary, has written a dissertation on Pastoral Psychology in which there are many references to American literature on this subject.

Still another comment was that "normalcy" is much a matter of the general setting of the individual; some people are just naturally more melancholy than others and therefore for them such a mental state is normal whereas for others a similar state might at least be a borderline case that required help.

Another comment was that borderline patients are often more willing to seek help from a psychiatrist if their ministers counsel them to do so.

It was also commented that in the Netherlands some institutions are "shock happy"; that if shock therapy is administered at the very outset there is little that can subsequently be done by analytic treatment; and that by starting with psycho-therapies one can at least "see where one is going."

- - - - -

Business Meeting held Thurs. April 8, 1954 -A.M.

1. Motion carried that this Conference be held again next year at approximately the same time.
 - It was commented that the dates should not conflict with those of the American Psychiatric Assoc., and that if made coincident with college spring vacation more Professors would be able to attend.
2. Motion carried that the Conference continue on a broad basis of both Psychology and Psychiatry from the Calvinistic standpoint.
 - It was emphasized that the area for discussion should be left to cover the broad field, and it was suggested that general topics could be treated in the a.m. sessions and more specific ones in the p.m. sessions.
3. Motion carried that a widely representative committee be elected to determine the character and content of the next conference program.
4. Motion carried that this proposed conference committee be elected from an approved list of nominees.
5. Motion carried to accept the offer of Calvin College to serve as host for next year's conference.
 - The thought was expressed that at this time the Conference does not feel that it wants to be sponsored by any specific institution, and it was also stated that Hope College does not want to be excluded from being host at some future time.
6. Motion carried that this present Conference expresses its appreciation to Calvin College for the use of its facilities, and that Chairman E. Heerema is to convey this by letter to the College President.
7. Motion carried that this present Conference expresses its appreciation to Dr. K. Kuiper of Bethesda Sanatorium for instigating the movement to call this Conference, and to the Committee (Messrs. Heerema, Jaarsma, Heynen, Fiekker and Daling) for formulating the program and making the necessary arrangements.

8. Motion carried that this Conference express its appreciation to Prof. Jan Waterink of the Free University at Amsterdam (who for this semester is visiting lecturer at Calvin College and Seminary) for his cooperation and participation in this conference, and that Chairman Heerema is to convey this by letter.
9. Motion carried that this Conference express its appreciation to Mr. James Split of Pine Rest for his services as reporter of this Conference.
10. Motion carried that the arrangements Committee of this present Conference be empowered to mimeograph and distribute the report of this Conference if such is financially possible.
 - It was also stated that members could be assessed for whatever financial deficiency will be entailed by distributing the report.
11. Motion carried that simple plurality will constitute election to the Committee for next year's Conference.
 - The following were elected from the various areas:
 - educational and academic - J.T. Daling and C. Jaarsma;
 - pastoral - Revs. E. Heerema and Wm. Hiemstra;
 - clinical psychology - D. Blocksma and J. Split;
 - institutional psychiatric - K. Kuiper and Joh. Plekker;
 - community psychiatric - A. Hoekstra
12. Motion carried that a news item of this conference be prepared by the conference reporter for placement in the various church papers with a note that the report of this conference will be available at a nominal fee.
13. It was suggested that the newly elected Conference Committee give some consideration to the following items:
 - a) The feasibility of having an evening meeting of a somewhat public kind especially addressed to psychiatric nurses, students, etc. for purpose of interesting and encouraging young people to take up work in the fields of psychology and psychiatry.
 - b) Soliciting articles for publication in our periodicals to interest more people in these fields.
 - c) How those persons being trained in these fields can be used and how employers in our circles can be motivated for the placement of such as are already trained as well as creating situations or positions for the use of such who are interested in these fields.
 - d) What sort of clinical instruction would be advisable for theological students.
 - e) Finding out what sort of topics the conference members would like to have treated at the next conference.

Thursday, April 8, 1954 - Afternoon Session

Prof. C. Jaarsma - PSYCHOLOGY AND MENTAL HYGIENE IN THE SCHOOLS

A reprint of the complete text of this talk is appended to these proceedings. (It was published in the May - June issue of the TORCH and TRUMPET).

DISCUSSION of Dr. Jaarsma's talk:

When you use the term "totally different", do you mean this collectively or distributively?

The former. It is the total impact, the situation as a whole that is different between Christian and non-Christian teaching; there are, of course, many similarities with respect to the individual parts.

Is there a basis of learning that is common to all children?

Yes.

Why do you consider the Ego as something specifically created in contrast to heredity and growth?

Because human learning is always the acceptance of truth as disclosure of reality, not merely a means of adjustment to reality; animals merely make adjustments to the present moment, in human beings the learning is the activity of a subject who is active, responsible, choosing, serving. It is the "I" which thinks, feels, wills, appreciates, etc.; and these are not traits which the human beings gets but are attributes of the person who has a uniqueness and individual responsibility.

It was stated that learning is the movement of the individual toward a goal; are the direction and goal then determined by the person's commitments?

Yes.

It was stated that only to the degree that the teacher himself has achieved self-knowledge, self-control, and surrender to truth can he really try to teach others; to what extent then do children in the classroom accept the faith of the teachers?

That would be an interesting research project.

Is the average college graduate who plans to enter the teaching profession able to distinguish between "real needs" and "felt needs"?

Actual experience is, of course, required, but here at Calvin College we try to make the prospective teachers aware of this difference. We alert them to it.

It was also commented that if the learning process is to develop properly there must be a basic agreement between the basic principles operative in the school and in the home.

And a question was raised whether it wouldn't be a good thing that Seminary students and prospective teachers have some group therapy instruction and experience to get some of these problems out into the open.

- - - - -

Dr. A. Hoekstra - THE CHRISTIAN PSYCHIATRIST IN THE COMMUNITY (1)

One role of the Christian psychiatrist in the community is that of practitioner who is trying to help someone to mental health. What are his motivations for doing this? Some say that it is something like the parent-child relationship. According to Margaret Mead, during the Middle Ages, the child was considered as something of economic value, a sort of social security for old age; whereas in contemporary American life the child is considered to be something delightful, a source of pleasure for those who have them. The both of these notions may provide some sort of motivation for the psychiatrist in his role as practitioner, for the Christian who is engaged in this work the basic motivation is the placing of a God prescribed value on the individual, that the patient is creationally a child of God, an imagebearer of the Divine.

In his method, the Christian practitioner in this field should not align himself unreservedly with any one school of thought. If he does so, he makes himself unavailable to possible contributions from other schools. "Selling oneself out" to a single method means basically that the person is afraid of his role or place.

What is the goal that the Christian practitioner should aim for? Is it to put the person back into his ordinary role in life? Or, must he work for a greater goal of facilitating the patient's re-uniting with his God? Is it the Christian psychiatrist's particular responsibility to work for the religious conversion of his patient? Of course, when the patient is a Christian it is part of the practitioner's task to get the patient to have a better conception of his sense of guilt whether this is something that stems from his relation to God and therefore grounded or that it stems from his relation to or with his fellowman and therefore may be groundless. And it may be added that non-Christian psychiatrists often seem quite successful in their treatment of Christian patients.

Another role that the Christian psychiatrist has is that of his responsibility to the community. For example, if he works in a clinic or agency he most likely works with a variety of other practitioners who have different philosophies of life and different religious backgrounds. Thus he here has to work cooperatively with them to achieve the common goal of re-uniting the patient with his own culture instead of trying to get the patient united with the

(1) This is a synopsis based on the reporter's notes and sec'y notes

It was also commented that if the learning process is to develop properly there must be a basic agreement between the basic principles operative in the school and in the home.

And a question was raised whether it wouldn't be a good thing that Seminary students and prospective teachers have some group therapy instruction and experience to get some of these problems out into the open.

Dr. A. Hoekstra - THE CHRISTIAN PSYCHIATRIST IN THE COMMUNITY (1)

One role of the Christian psychiatrist in the community is that of practitioner who is trying to help someone to mental health. What are his motivations for doing this? Some say that it is something like the parent-child relationship. According to Margaret Mead, during the Middle Ages, the child was considered as something of economic value, a sort of social security for old age; whereas in contemporary American life the child is considered to be something delightful, a source of pleasure for those who have them. The both of these notions may provide some sort of motivation for the psychiatrist in his role as practitioner, for the Christian who is engaged in this work the basic motivation is the placing of a God prescribed value on the individual, that the patient is creationally a child of God, an imagebearer of the Divine.

In his method, the Christian practitioner in this field should not align himself unreservedly with any one school of thought. If he does so, he makes himself unavailable to possible contributions from other schools. "Selling oneself out" to a single method means basically that the person is afraid of his role or place.

What is the goal that the Christian practitioner should aim for? Is it to put the person back into his ordinary role in life? Or, must he work for a greater goal of facilitating the patient's re-uniting with his God? Is it the Christian psychiatrist's particular responsibility to work for the religious conversion of his patient? Of course, when the patient is a Christian it is part of the practitioner's task to get the patient to have a better conception of his sense of guilt whether this is something that stems from his relation to God and therefore grounded or that it stems from his relation to or with his fellowman and therefore may be groundless. And it may be added that non-Christian psychiatrists often seem quite successful in their treatment of Christian patients.

Another role that the Christian psychiatrist has is that of his responsibility to the community. For example, if he works in a clinic or agency he most likely works with a variety of other practitioners who have different philosophies of life and different religious backgrounds. Thus he here has to work cooperatively with them to achieve the common goal of re-uniting the patient with his own culture instead of trying to get the patient united with the

(1) This is a synopsis based on the reporter's notes and sec'y notes

specific culture of the Christian practitioner. Such would seem to be part of the responsibility he has to his community.

But the Christian psychiatrist also has the community responsibility of looking at the culture in which the illness arises or the milieu in which the patient lives, and he may then see aspects of it which are a source of unhealthy situations which will almost make it inevitable that some will break down mentally. For example, in a city like Grand Rapids there are some very tightly knit groups: the Polish-Catholic, the Irish-Catholic, the Dutch-Reformed. In each of these there are those who cling only to the values or cultural stereotypes of that group as external securities. For instance "dutchisms" of various kinds (such as "coffee time", etc.) are still retained that are now far removed from their original purpose; some of the cultural stereotypes are adhered to much more rigidly here in America than they are by contemporaries in the Netherlands. The same could be said of the Irish in-groups, etc. Certain kinds of "in-group respectabilities" (such as clean houses, attitude toward movies, etc.) become maintained as mere symbols instead of spiritual values. In line with this there is also the characteristic set of American values which are of a strictly materialistic kind, the things that can be seen like shiny cars, clean ash-trays, etc. The point is that instead of cultivating real emotional or spiritual values that are inwardly satisfying, such clinging to external forms and outward show characteristic of the "in-groups" may be a real cause of illness. For, such attitudes are likely to lead to fears of not being accepted by the members of the "in-group" on the basis of this or that external thing: like not having enough of the right kind of clothes at the right season of the year, or of being criticized as having too much variety of clothing. In short, instead of rebelling against the externalistic or materialistic stereotypes of the "in-group" on the basis of or in favor of real spiritual values, there develop fears of not being accepted in terms of the stereotype; for it is a fact that often members of the "in-group" do tend to criticize those who do not adhere to the codes of that group. Others, may rebel.

On the basis of his experiences concerning the cultural causes of mental illness, therefore, the Christian psychiatrist also has a duty to the community to re-act to or make evaluations of the cultural curiosities or even monstrosities that give rise to mental ailment. He must represent a point of view. He cannot treat all the social ills, nor can he correct all the conditions. But he can attempt to point out the direction, or offer a point of view which can serve as guidance in evaluating which sorts of cultural practices or trends do not contribute to mental health but damage it. Thus for example, he can call attention to the present-day curious medical hospital practice in obstetrics where "anti-septicism" is prized above "motheringness", that is to say that it seems much more important to keep the new-born baby free from germs than that it receive the affectionate fondling of the mother which from the standpoint of mental hygiene is very much more important. Or again, it may also be his duty to call attention to the foibles in church life e.g. the Christian's duty to love is often presented in such a manner that it cannot be accepted, for it sometimes seems that it is said with an attitude of hate that we must love!

DISCUSSION of Dr. A. Hoekstra's talk:

Is there any particular school of thought that is more compatible with the Christian message than others?

No. Schools rise and fall/^{on} or with the civilization in which they arose. But we can borrow from many different ones. From the analytic standpoint, Karen Horney is perhaps the least extreme.

As a minister I find "social restraints" (which you might include among "cultural stereotypes") as good barriers.

Where they are good, they are effective. But it is often superfluous to use them in the case of a particular patient because he is in a state of rebellion and it is necessary first to find out what it is that caused the rebellion. E.g. a certain "in-group" may frown severely on movie attendance and for that reason the child is discouraged from doing so; but the point ought to be reached where the child accepts the restrictions out of love.

I find that Jung's most acceptable concept is that of God. Is this usable in most situations in your work?

When patients ask me, I in turn ask them, "Why do you ask me?" My purpose is to find out whether they want to see if they are accepted or rejected because of christian belief. When this is cleared up, I tell them what my personal belief is. I admit that this is a big problem and that I do not necessarily have the answer.

Some of my parishioners declare, "Why are you always preaching at me?" I know that they need psychiatric care, but how does one go about getting them to see a psychiatrist?

That is a big question. Are there any ideas? Some Suggestions: Gently turn the question to where the patient actually arrives at the answer without you yourself directly advising them to see a psychiatrist. Tell them a mental problem is like a body problem and thus requires the attention of the kind of person competent to deal with it. As a general medical practitioner I find that one of the things that works is to ask the person, after he has been treated physically, whether there are any things that he would like to talk over. Perhaps the psychiatrists themselves are somewhat at fault; they ought to begin with the physical, such is often a base that leads to a problem after rapport has been established or after the physical has been ruled out or taken account of.

Another comment made was that psychiatry should never be divorced from the physical for the two run together. This was somewhat countered by another comment to the effect that in the case of an obvious mental disturbance money should not be wasted on rather extensive medical laboratory work before treatment is begun. (On this point there was expressed some difference of opinion).

In your practice, do you deal with the children alone? What is needed to bring back a family relationship in which the child can develop properly?

A child should not be treated directly or in isolation solely. The parents too ought to be called in. Attention should be given to the total family structure, parents as well as the child.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MENTAL HYGIENE IN THE SCHOOLS

by

- C. Jaarsma -

Introduction

The title or subject announced may not reflect adequately what I would like to submit for discussion. Perhaps Psychological Problems with Reference to Classroom Teaching would more adequately convey what I have in mind. But since my paper is merely to be introductory you will permit me this latitude, I am sure.

In his recent book on Sex in Childhood and Youth, Dr. Alfred Schmieding of Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois, makes this observation, "There has for some time been a closer drawing together of teaching and psychology. And if I see the signs aright, there is at present an approach between teaching and psychiatry. Teaching and psychiatry need each other." (1). We all recognize that the study of child growth and development, and the study of the learning process as it takes place in the modern classroom have disclosed valuable data pertaining to teaching and school organization. Education is the sense of theory and practice of learning and teaching in the school has become an independent field of study and research, a science in the broad sense of that word. Psychology, and more recently psychiatry, as auxiliary or contributing sciences with relation to education, are important to the student of education because they constitute sources of indispensable data to him.

It is my assignment to place before you certain problems in the field where psychology and education meet, and that is educational psychology. In order to do this I propose to discuss those topics. First I should like you to consider some principles basic to interpretation in this area. Then we shall consider some important concepts. And finally refer to some psychological problems in classroom teaching.

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE NATURE OF MAN.

The principles to which I refer may be subsumed under the broad concept of the nature of man according to Scripture in distinction from non-theistic or antitheistic concepts in vogue today. And then for our purpose I am thinking particularly of four aspects of the doctrine of man as contained in the Scripture: (1) man is a religious being; (2) man is an organic unity; (3) attributes or qualities that characterize him as person; (4) the religious being in his personality.

First of all, man is a religious being. God created man a living being in His image. Man is a self-conscious, self-determining being, a person who can communicate with God, fellowship with Him, and with whom God communes and has fellowship. This fellowship, communion with God is man's very life. It is his basic motivation. Man can be understood rightly only in this motivation. Even in his sinful state, dead in trespasses and sins, outside of God's communion and broken from within, man is motivated religiously. Religious

(1) p. 128.

aspiration is not a phase of human development that we acquire environmentally to consummate an urge among other urges of organic structure. Man's every longing, his every expression, and his every purpose has its root in his religious nature.

In the second place, man is an organic unity. He functions as a whole in every relationship of life. The soul life, or mental life, if you will, is interrelated with physiological structure and function by the spirit or person, the life principle of man's organic unity. It is I who think, feel, will, see, push, choose, follow, etc. And the principle of integration is not found in the interaction of an organism with the environment, as modern psychology has it, but in the self-determining person as he extends himself into his environment.

Thirdly, the attributes of the person as a religious being may be stated as rational, moral, social, esthetic, free, and responsible. Man is rational, that is he can know truth, and the truth. He is moral, that is can value and choose the good, or evil. He is social, that is he can communicate and fellowship. He is esthetic, that is he can appreciate beauty, the harmonious. He is free, that is he can choose voluntarily. He is responsible, that is he is accountable. These are not traits man develops in the course of man's becoming nature, as psychologies of non-theistic and anti-theistic brands would have us believe, but they are attributes of a person as religious being.

A fourth principle very important to the Christian educator who seeks to interpret psychological data correctly is the principle of personality. It is a much abused word today. Man is not only a unity in his person, but he also experiences a unity as he extends himself. As infant he experiences this unity in the family life. As he develops it reaches beyond the family. His very well-being depends upon his ability to extend himself into his broadening community in a feeling of unity. We say a person is well-poised when he carries himself well in his body and controls himself in a situation. We call him keen when he penetrates an external situation intellectually with good balance and composure. In these and similar situations the person extends himself physiologically, socially-emotionally and intellectually or, better said in his knowing life. One or more of these dimensions of a personality may be predominant, but they are all involved in one another. We think physiologically, socially, and emotionally as well as in reasoning, though reasoning predominates. We enjoy a party socially and emotionally, but we like the eats too, and make some clever observations in conversation. The unity of the personality is not in the summation of traits, as some non-theistic psychologies would have us believe, but in the extension of himself with a feeling of wholeness based on the person as a religious being.

Now, it seems to me, these principles, rightly understood, separate us miles from modern psychological thinking. This does not mean that psychological studies in education as those of Strang, and Thurstone, and Symonds, and Jersil, just to mention a few names, who do not share with us these principles, do not make a significant contribution to our scripturally oriented thinking. Quite on the contrary, we look upon these contributions as the

work of God in sinful men. Neither does it mean that our observations and conclusions in our psychological studies will be true because we are in possession of true principles. We can make, and do make mistakes in spite of true principles.

Some Important Concepts

In line with what we have said about the nature of man, we should make some basic distinctions in the use of terms. The four terms that, I think, should be clear are: growth, development, learning, and teaching.

In the bio-social psychology, so generally accepted in educational circles today, growth and development are nearly used interchangeably. The followers of the Dewey line of thought in contemporary educational theory have made growth the basic concept in education. Says the former Dr. R. Schorling, a well-known figure at the University of Michigan for years, "— today we say that education is growth." (2)

On the basis of what we have said about the nature of man, we as Christians must demur. We shall be called upon to construct a terminology that reflects our basic concepts of education.

What is growth? A plant grows. That is the biological potential inherent in the seed comes to expression in an environment favorable to it. Given the proper nurture of soil, atmosphere, etc. a bulb becomes a gorgeous tulip. It is a process of maturation biologically, and adaptation and adjustment environmentally. A child too grows as he matures physiologically in structure. We speak of a growth spurt in early childhood because we observe a rapid maturation and increase in length and weight of the body. The word growth is physiologically oriented, and only psychologists who reduce soul life to physiological structure and function can use the term to apply to all human life as the person progresses to maturity. The word development is psychically oriented, as well as physiologically. As the line of demarcation between physiological function and the psyche or soul life is not always clear (it is hard to determine where the one leaves off and the other begins), so the distinction between these two terms cannot always be drawn clearly. However development applies especially to the social-emotional and the knowing functions of the person. The infant develops language skills. A child develops insight in number relations. As he matures in physiological structure and function, he develops control over his smaller muscles so that he can hold a pencil and guide it across the paper. Growth and development are involved in one another. Growth physiologically is a basis for development in the soul life of a child. But it should be clear that use of the terms interchangeably is based on the prescientific commitment that man is a product of nature.

Now the word learning. It can be used in a broad sense so we use it when we say a child learns to walk. In this sense Pavlov's dog learned to secrete saliva at the ringing of a bell. Thorndike's cat learned to turn the latch; Kohler's ape learned to fasten two sticks together to get a banana. Used in this sense learning is no more than growth and development. Animals can make adaptations and

(2) Schorling, R., Student Teaching, p. 29.

adjustments in their physiological function and limited psychic function that have the appearance of learning. And in infants the difference is hardly observable, though Kellogg found that the difference between learning of an ape and a child soon becomes evident in the greater transfer in the experience of a child. To make human learning continuous with organismic changes is based upon a prescientific commitment, not on demonstrated fact. And, let me add, this view of learning has done and is doing untold harm in modern education in America's schools.

Learning is the self-conscious activity of a subject. The subject, person, in his knowing function penetrates a situation for understanding, that is, he lays hold upon, apprehends relationships, accepts truth disclosed therein, and orders the dimensions of his personality accordingly. Not creative expression, but expression of self-surrender to truth is the culmination of learning. Even a pragmatist as W. H. Kilpatrick states that no one has learned anything until he has accepted it in his heart. This statement of a spokesman for the growth concept of education reminds one of the statement of the high priest when he said it was profitable that one man die for the people. He made a pronouncement the significance of which he himself did not fathom. But Kilpatrick would rise in horror to hear his statement quoted out of context and given scriptural orientation. Yet, what he said defines learning on the basis of scriptural principles.

When Paul enjoins the Ephesians to "put on the complete armor of God", he is not merely saying that they are to cover themselves externally. The context makes it amply clear that the putting on is an act of person acceptance and discipline. In learning the subject puts on truth in the sense that the Scripture speaks of it in the passage referred to, namely Ephesians 6. Truth is not of our making. It is of God only. Truth is disclosed to us in the learning process, and it is in the acceptance of it in the heart that we fulfil our God-given purpose as religious beings. We see, therefore, how far wrong modern educational theory and practice is when it speaks of learning as growth and development. Such identification is based on the denial of man as religious being and of truth as God-given.

Because we define learning as putting on truth, the concept teaching too has a distinctive meaning in Christian education.

Teaching cannot mean putting truth on the learner. Only the learner can put on truth. Therefore, when we speak of teaching as imparting knowledge or disciplining the mind, we are using non-scientific expressions. And we cannot build a science on non-scientific expressions. Let me illustrate. We all speak of the sun setting and rising. But we cannot build astronomy on such non-scientific concepts, for the sun does not actually set, but the earth rotates. Astronomically therefore we speak of rotation and revolution of the earth. This is scientifically correct. Likewise it is not wrong to speak of imparting knowledge in a naive, unscientific sense. In life we experience a setting sun, and the imparting of knowledge. But if we are going to be scientifically accurate in our terminology, which we must in order to construct a systematic body of knowledge called a science, we shall be required to use words descriptive of scientific fact and principle.

Let it also be clear that we cannot make a child learn. We can coerce a child into performance, but we cannot coerce him into putting on truth. Learning is a voluntary, self-conscious act of acceptance. A subject is never a passive docile object molded and formed at will by a teacher. Only God can take hold of a person and mold him and make him after His will. But this act of God is as mysterious as the very origin of the person in conception. You and I are not born of the pairing of genes and chromosomes, though these chemical constituencies enter into the making of our organic unity. A favorite professor in my days of graduate study, Dr. H. H. Horne, was fond of saying, "In part we are born; in part we are made; and in part we make ourselves." As philosophical idealist he could say no more. But it is scriptural when we say we make ourselves. A child makes himself in learning.

Yet it may be said that a teacher is engaged in man-making, a term borrowed from the former Harvard professor, W. E. Hocking. In what sense do we think of teaching as doing something to the learner?

On the one hand we can set up an external situation which a learner on his level of maturity can penetrate with our help, apprehend its relationships, come to grips with truth disclosed therein, and accept it. To do this we must activate the learner in the motivation of his entire person to focus his attention upon the object of knowledge. We can also communicate with a learner in personal fellowship. Love provides the basis for fellowship of trust and commitment. In this person to person relationship the knowing function of the learner is cleared of barriers that inhibit penetration and apprehension of meaning.

We recognize that good, effective teaching does both. It organizes the external situation for meaningful apprehension and activates the learner in it. But it also establishes a personal communication of teacher and pupil in which the teacher speaks with authority in love. In teaching we form and structure the learner in the sense that norms and objectives are authoritatively established for the learner, and that we seek control of the learner through activating, motivating him to accept these norms and objectives. But this involves the learning process of a subject, not a passive submission of an object. We may, therefore, define teaching as guiding and directing learning. But this definition must be interpreted against the background of what we have said about growth, development, and learning. We cannot, may not be satisfied with the pragmatist's and naturalist's conception of teaching as guidance. Modern school counseling and guidance often falls prey to this error.

In our conception of teaching too we are miles removed from modern educational theory and practice. An impassable gulf separates us all along the line. Ours is an interpretation that springs from a life of faith, as dwelling in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. The modern man outside of Christ views these things too in the blindness of his vaunted autonomy. We are called authoritarian and regimentationists. But the educational wastelands of the man of modernity mistakes the slavery of self-exaltation for freedom.

Psychological Problems in Classroom Teaching

Against the background of this general discussion of principles and concepts, we should turn to the study of psychological problems peculiar to the classroom, and appraise psychological studies that can contribute to effective classroom teaching.

I should like to refer, and I can do no more in this discussion, to five major classes of problems falling within the scope of educational psychology. They are motivation, learning, aptitudes, appraisal, and the personality of the teacher.

First of all the meaning and nature of motivation.

I take it that motivation in learning and teaching no longer means to us what it meant in pre-psychology days, namely how to make adult subject matter as tasteful as possible to a child or how to fit a child into adult experiences.

We recognize that motivation has two sources. One is the needs (not to be interpreted as momentary, fleeting interests) of a child on his level of development and learning, and the other is the goals he can be brought to feel in his total person. What will set a subject going in his whole person to achieve? desirable end? Two things. One, there must be a real need for the end sought in his life. Two, the end must be envisioned by the subject as the consummation of the need. The teacher is to arouse a real need into a felt need to activate a learner to self-conscious activity, and to bring the consummating end into view as a goal to be achieved.

Psychological studies of child life under school conditions as well as studies of child life in general will give us the data we need for right understanding of child needs and goals in child development and learning. Psychological studies do not establish goals for child life. They interpret goals normatively established as directional process goals in the development and learning of children. For example, we seek the holiness and perfection of God's children. In educational language we may speak of this goal as the nature personality exercising self-discipline in the service of God. This goal is prescribed normatively for Christian education. A child attains to this goal through felt needs motivated by envisioned goals that can enter his life for self-discipline at his stage of development and learning.

But observed data in psychological studies are interpreted according to our view of child nature. For example, the bio-social psychologist interprets needs as basically physiological. These needs give rise to functional tensions that are resolved by establishing an equilibrium through environmental influences. Goals in child life are environmental influences for resolving functional tensions in a biological organism. Teaching of reading in school has this psychological significance. But if we view a child as a religious being created to image God in his total personality, the needs and tensions we observe in child life will be viewed quite differently. They are the expression of a person who in every dimension of his personality finds the consummation of his longings in the love and fellowship which only God affords. Every motivation is a religious motivation consummated religiously. Teaching of reading has a

psychological significance which goes far deeper than resolving tensions environmentally. It is a source for disclosing truth to the heart of the learner for acceptance and self-discipline. According to the non-theist the need for expression is related to goals which exalt the ego or self and self-assurance. The Christian viewing a child's need for expression in the disharmony of sin relates it to goals of obedience and penitence. But needs and envisioning goals, and the process of attaining envisioned goals call for psychological study.

A second set of problems pertains to learning.

Already I have stated how we view learning as activity of a subject.

How does learning as the self-conscious activity of a subject in penetrating, apprehending and accepting the object of knowledge in its true relations take place? To ask the question as I do already indicates how little we can do with current theories of learning. When the bio-social psychologist makes thinking and creative expression the pride and glory of man, we reply by saying that thinking and expression are phases of the learning process, not goals and norms. We seek wisdom and understanding, and these are of the heart. The pride and glory of man is heart acceptance of truth and the expression of truth in his life. Then he images God, Who is the truth.

A child in his development to maturity is a learner. His entire life style and his total personality is involved. As person he learns. But he is a child, not an adult. He learns as child. When Herbart turned to adults to understand learning, he concluded that a child in the learning process proceeds from the simple to the complex, from the known to the unknown. Hence, reading was taught by putting together the sounds of the letters of the alphabet, and arithmetic was taught by counting and memorizing combinations. He did not understand child life because he inferred from adult knowledge the learning of children. But Thorndike made as great an error when he constructed three laws of learning based on what he observed in the bungling of rats and cats as they strove for food. He thought a child is only a step or two removed from the ways of a cat.

We learn how a child learns from observing a child learn when we rightly view child nature. Then we can study the various forms learning takes and avoid raising any one of them to the generalized learning process. There are skills, both physical and mental, to be mastered. There is informational content to be remembered. There are habits of conduct to be routinized and mechanized. There are appreciations to be cultivated. There are insights and values to be attained. All of these need separate study as forms or kinds of learning. But all of these are meaningfully integrated in a life of understanding and wisdom by the subject self-consciously motivated by right goals.

The social-emotional climate of the classroom constitutes an important area of study with reference to the learning process. One

psychologist has called man a security hunter. Emotional security plays a large part in child growth and development. We know that a child needs a feeling of security for learning and teaching to take hold. It is in the social-emotional relationships that a child finds his security in school. When we understand this rightly we shall be able to give learning the social-emotional orientation needed for acceptance of and commitment to truth. Heart acceptance takes place in a feeling of security. The key to a social-emotional climate conducive to effective learning is love. Love is the law of life. To the extent that one truly loves does one live. To the extent that hostility dominates, effective learning is barred. How to establish a social-emotional climate the fruit of love is more than a psychological problem. It is first of all a problem of one's relationship to God. But restoration of this relationship does not automatically restore harmony of functions in the person broken by sin. It is a problem that has psychological aspects, especially in a classroom situation.

"Transfer of training", unfortunate terminology in human learning, has been an area of psychological study in the past. I shall refer to it only in passing, and then with the suggestion that in learning as we view it this problem takes on another meaning. Nevertheless, carry over from one learning situation to another needs further study, also in this view of learning and teaching.

A third set of problems has to do with aptitudes.

Aptitudes too must be viewed as distinctly personal, aptitudes of a person. Intelligence is not an entity of mind, or an isolated capacity. Nor is it function of brain cells or of a neuro-muscular system. It is the general capacity of the knowing function of a person. A person acts intelligently or unintelligently. Animals may appear to act intelligently because intelligence is first defined in terms of adjustments observed in animal life. But the knowing function is unique in man as religious being. And the capacity for knowing is likewise unique. So when we seek to measure this capacity we are well aware of it being the expression of the whole person. Never will we permit our inferences from our attempted measurement of the knowing function in general to lead us to conclusions beyond the restricted area under investigation. The same applies to special aptitudes. The Lord endows a person with gifts, general and specific. But they are not isolated qualities or entities in the person. They are aptitudes of a total person to be understood in his total life style. Our view of the providence of God in the life of every person will keep us from any form of determinism in ascertaining a child's future development and learning.

The Christian teacher will use aptitude tests as a source of information among many other sources. As much, if not more value will be attached to remedial measures. And perhaps most of all an anecdotal record or behavior journal of day-by-day indications of a child's developing way of life will constitute source data for the teacher. God endows His people with varied aptitudes. We are to discover them and bring them to expression in God-like ways.

Appraisal of learning outcomes constitutes a related area of problems. What constitutes significant learning outcomes in school? How can we measure them? How can we appraise a learner's progress as the result of forming done in teaching? This study wholly belongs in the field of educational psychology, since the data are derived from a classroom situation. When we consider that Christian education has a distinctive objective, a distinctive view of the learner, of learning, and of teaching, it follows that the measurement of learning outcomes will involve a distinctive approach. Standardized achievement testing as carried on in secular education is of doubtful significance in Christian education. Grading and marking on the basis of factual knowledge gained from books or dictated notes too are misleading, to say the least. If we mean business with learning outcomes distinctly Christian, our appraisal too must point in that direction. Here a large field of research opens up to us.

Finally, the teacher as a factor in the learning process points us to a group of psychological problems. Books have been written on the psychology of the teacher. The analyst in psychiatry tells us that one must himself be analyzed, that is, have gained insight into his own dynamics, before he can help others adequately. I am not capable of appraising this statement. But a parallel statement can be made truthfully about teachers and teaching. Only to the degree that a teacher has achieved self-knowledge, self-surrender and self-control, and to the degree that he knows himself in his three-fold office as a religious being, prophet, priest and king, can he help pupils achieve these qualities in themselves. A teacher, for example, who lacks reasonable insight in his emotional life, is seriously handicapped in constructive effectiveness with his pupils. A teacher needs much insight in his own personality. Many problems of control in the classroom may stem from his own emotional security.

There is a psychology of the teacher. Only a teacher who daily walks with the Lord in the light of His truth can lead a child into the truth. A teacher cannot form others in that which lacks form in his own life.

I have tried to indicate briefly the broad areas of problems pertaining to psychology in the classroom. We can profit greatly from the secular psychologist and educationist as he defines problems and observes data. But we shall have to be very alert to interpretations that reduce the learner and learning to something less than a religious being created to image God. It is not merely the absence of spiritual values in the value system of modern education that sends the modern educator into wrong channels. But it is his faulty conception of a child. We need studies in educational psychology that view a child for what he really is, a son of God.